

REMARKS

Claims 1-37 are pending in the application. By this Amendment Applicant has amended claims 1, 7, 19, 24, 29 and 33.

Telephonic Interview

A telephonic interview was held between the Examiner and the undersigned attorney for Applicant on June 28, 2007. On the same day Applicant filed a Substance of Interview statement summarizing the substance of the discussions occurring during the interview. Applicant is appreciative of the time taken by the Examiner to conduct the interview and consider Applicant's various positions.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

In the above Office Action the Examiner reiterated rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 11, 13, 15, 19-26, 28-32, and rejected claims 33-35 and 37, under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Wagner (U.S. Pub. No. 20030233296).

In the interests of brevity and clarity of presentation, Applicant will not repeat the arguments made in the Remarks accompanying the Request for Continued Examination filed April 9, 2007 in response to the outstanding rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Rather, Applicant hereby incorporates such Remarks by reference herein, and further addresses the above outstanding rejection on the basis of the arguments and claim amendments hereinafter described.

As was observed by Applicant's representative during the telephonic interview referenced above, the Wagner system does not appear to permit the affirmative selection of a particular data source during the design of a report file used for report generation. Moreover, Wagner also does not appear to contemplate that a plurality of data sources are available to be associated with components of such a report file, and does not enable users to select from among such plural sources as presently claimed. This necessarily follows from the configuration of the Wagner system; specifically, the "information sources" 4-1, 4-2, etc. depicted in FIGS. 1-2 are incapable of being selected during any process of report design or generation that may be effected through such system. That is, although the computer 1 of the Wagner system appears to

have visibility into the contents of database 3a, the computer 1 of Wagner is incapable of discerning which information sources 4 may provide information to the database 3a and is similarly unable to "select" or otherwise associate any of the information sources 4 with any aspect of a report.

In order to emphasize this apparent distinction between the system of the present invention and the Wagner system, independent claims 1, 7, 19, 24 and 33 have been amended to recite that the claimed data sources be "presented for selection via a user interface". Since in the Wagner system the information sources 4 do not appear to be "visible" to the computer 1, it is also clearly the case that such data sources may not be "presented for selection" via a user interface or otherwise.

Claim 29 has been similarly amended to indicated that "user-specified" associations exist between various data sources and report groups. Again, the Wagner system does not permit specification by a user of an association between a data source and any aspect of a report, since the data sources in the Wagener system are not accessible or otherwise visible to user computer 1.


Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the remarks herein prior to further examination of the above-identified application. The undersigned would of course be available to discuss the present application with the Examiner if, in the opinion of the Examiner, such a discussion could lead to resolution of any outstanding issues.

Dated: June 29, 2007

Cooley Godward LLP
ATTN: Patent Group
Five Palo Alto Square
3000 El Camino Real
Palo Alto, CA 94306-2155
Tel: (650) 843-5000
Fax: (650) 857-0663

Respectfully submitted,
COOLEY GODWARD LLP

By:


Kevin J. Zimmer
Reg. No. 36,977